2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

v.

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

22

2324

25

26

2728

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY NEWARK DIVISION

Jean-Marc Zimmerman ZIMMERMAN & LEVI, LLP 226 St. Paul Street Westfield, NJ 07090 Tel: (908) 654-8000 Fax: (908) 654-7207 jmzimmerman@zlk.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Anti-Pinch Solutions, LLC

ANTI-PINCH SOLUTIONS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

BMW OF NORTH AMERICA, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No.

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff Anti-Pinch Solutions, LLC ("Plaintiff") files this Complaint against BMW of North America, LLC ("Defendant" or "BMW") for infringement of United States Patent No. 5,399,950 ("the '950 patent"). A copy of the '950 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

JURISDICTION

- This is an action for patent infringement under Title 35 of the United States Code.
 Plaintiff is seeking injunctive relief as well as damages.
- 2. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 (Federal Question) and 1338(a) (Patents) because this is a civil action for patent infringement arising under the United States patent statutes.
- 3. Venue is proper in the District of New Jersey pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c) and 1400(b) because Defendant is deemed to reside in this district. In addition, and in the

alternative, Defendant has committed acts of infringement in this district and has regular and established places of business in this district.

- 4. Plaintiff Anti-Pinch Solutions, LLC is a Texas Limited Liability Company with its registered agent in Austin, Texas.
- 5. Defendant BMW is a Delaware limited liability corporation with its principal office located in Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey. This Court has personal jurisdiction over BMW because BMW has its principal office in the state of New Jersey. Further, BMW has committed, and continues to commit, acts of infringement in the state of New Jersey, has conducted business in the state of New Jersey, and/or has engaged in continuous and systematic activities in the state of New Jersey.
- 6. On information and belief, Defendant's products that are alleged herein to infringe were and continue to be made, used, imported, offered for sale, and/or sold in the state of New Jersey and BMW's practices that are alleged herein to infringe were and continue to be conducted in the state of New Jersey.
- 7. This court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant has committed acts of infringement in this district; is deemed to reside in this district; does business in this district; and/or has systematic and continuous contacts in this district.
- 8. This cause of action arises under the patent laws of the United States, and in particular, 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 *et seq*.
- 9. Plaintiff is the exclusive licensee of the '950 patent with rights to enforce the '950 patent and sue infringers.

10. The '950 patent, titled "Automatic Venting System For A Vehicle with Obstruction Detection Utilizing Dynamically Modified Thresholds," is valid, enforceable and was duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.

COUNT I

(INFRINGEMENT OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 5,399,950)

- 11. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 10 herein by reference.
- 12. On information and belief, BMW has and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '950 patent, including at least claim 1, by making, using, offering for sale, selling and/or importing infringing systems including, but not limited to, the anti-trapping system in its E60 or BMW 5 Series automobiles.
- 13. On information and belief, BMW has and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '950 patent, including at least claim 14, by practicing the methods claimed by one or more claims of the '950 patent including, but not limited to, BMW's use of and actions related to the anti-trapping system in its E60 or BMW 5 Series automobiles.
 - 14. BMW has been aware of the '950 patent at least as early as service of this action.
- 15. On information and belief, BMW has and continues to indirectly infringe one or more claims of the '950 patent by inducing other to infringe and/or contributing to the infringement of others in violation of 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 (b) and (c). On information and belief, BMW is aware, at least as early as service of this action, that the anti-trapping system in at least is E60 or BMW 5 Series automobiles is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use and is especially made and/or adapted for use in infringing the '950 patent.

- 16. BMW's actions complained of herein will continue unless BMW is enjoined by this Court.
 - 17. This case is exceptional pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 285.
 - 18. Plaintiff has complied with 35 U.S.C. § 287.
- 19. BMW's actions complained of herein are causing irreparable harm and monetary damage to Plaintiff and will continue to do so unless and until the BMW is enjoined and restrained by this Court.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff asks the Court to:

- a) Enter judgment for Plaintiff on this Complaint;
- b) Enjoin the Defendant, its agents, officers, servants, employees, attorneys and all persons in active concert or participation with the Defendant who receive notice of the order from further infringement of United States Patent No. 5,399,950;
- c) Award Plaintiff an ongoing royalty rate for Defendant's post-judgment infringement;
- d) Award Plaintiff damages resulting from Defendant's infringement in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- e) Treble the damages in accordance with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §284;
- f) Find the case to be exceptional under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 285;
- g) Award Plaintiff reasonable attorney fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285;
- h) Order the impounding and destruction of all Defendant's products that infringe the
 '950 patent;
- i) Award Plaintiff pre-judgment and post judgment interest and costs; and

1	j) Award Plaintiff such further relief to which the Court finds Plaintiff entitled under
2	law or equity.
3	DEMAND FOR HIDV TRIAL
4	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Disjutiff Anti-Dirack Solutions, LLC demands a trial by jury of all issues manufactuichle
5	Plaintiff Anti-Pinch Solutions, LLC demands a trial by jury of all issues properly triable
6	by jury in this action.
7	
8	
9	
10	By: <u>/s/Jean-Marc Zimmerman</u> Jean-Marc Zimmerman
11	ZIMMERMAN & LEVI, LLP 226 St. Paul Street
12	Westfield, NJ 07030
13	Tel: (908) 654-8000 Fax: (908) 654-7207
14	jmzimmerman@zlk.com
15	
16	Dated: June 29, 2010 Westfield, NJ
17	Westher, 10
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	5

Case 2:10-cv-03352-WHW-MCA Document 1 Filed 06/30/10 Page 5 of 5 PageID: 5